LIBRARIES

SUPPORTING SCHOLARS IN LITERATURE AND CULTURE AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON

Catherine J. Minter, Librarian for Germanic Studies, French & Italian, History & Philosophy of Science & Medicine, Classical Studies, and Linguistics

Luis A. González, Librarian for Latin American, Spanish & Portuguese, Latino, and European Studies

Angela Courtney, Librarian for English & American Literature, Comparative Literature, and Theatre & Drama

October 2019

INTRODUCTION

In 2018-19, the Indiana University Libraries conducted a study to examine the research practices and needs of scholars pursuing research in literature and culture on the Bloomington campus. This study was part of a larger nationwide series of studies by Ithaka S+R on the research support needs of faculty in various disciplines. Our local study underwent an internal ethics review by Indiana University's Institutional Review Board.

In spring 2019, a research team of three subject librarians from Arts and Humanities and Area Studies conducted in-person interviews with fourteen literature and culture scholars on our campus using a semi-structured set of questions developed by Ithaka S+R (see Appendix 1). Our interviewees varied in rank from junior to senior faculty. Around one third of the interviewees pursue English-language research, with the remainder specializing in ancient and modern languages, literature, and culture.

With participants' consent, all interviews were audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed by a professional transcription service. The anonymized transcripts were then coded and analyzed by the research team using a grounded theory methodology: i.e. a coding structure was developed by the investigators in the process of reading through the data.

Particular attention was paid during coding and analysis to informants' research support needs, with the objective of developing ideas for the improvement of library services. Several major themes recurred throughout this set of interviews, including research trends and methodologies in literary and cultural studies, types of sources utilized in this field and access preferences, scholarly communication, and research training and support. Our findings under these headings are presented below, together with recommendations for the improvement of local library services arising out of our analysis.

FINDINGS

Research in literature and culture

Trends in the field

In common with humanities researchers generally, the work of these scholars is characterized by continuity: most of our interviewees' current projects have evolved out of earlier research interests and expertise. A variation on this theme is the development of current research out of teaching practice: as one interviewee pointed out, the idea for his most recent book sparked from a text he teaches every year. However, even where current topics stay within the scholars' areas of research and teaching expertise, these researchers seek to incorporate innovative theoretical and methodological approaches into their projects. For example, in the case of a Spanish Golden Age scholar, this means exploring not only cognitive approaches to literary texts, but also adopting a transatlantic perspective, studying both colonial Spanish America and Spain.

The transformation of the discipline of literary studies is a recurrent theme across this set of interviews. While a few of our interviewees remain what we might call "literature scholars," more are now pursuing research of an interdisciplinary nature, drawing on a range of fields including legal studies, media studies and theory, museum studies, food studies, and cognitive science. Furthermore, a shift from narrowly defined literary scholarship to broadly conceived cultural studies is seen as a trend in the field: "My sense is that more and more literary studies is only part of what I and my colleagues are doing […]. I feel my branching out corresponds or is in accordance with the way the field is going." Some interviewees remark that this shift has had the effect of turning everything into a "text" for researchers in their field:

> And so I think as all of us are starting to look at all kinds of sources, I mean, anything's a text for us to study now.
>
> […] so the cultural studies aspects, which is how meaning is produced, beyond literary texts. Analysis of space, analysis of architecture, analysis of performances, and so in that sense, it's a more flexible, or larger, or more encompassing notion of what a text can be. The main question is how does this produce meaning? Film, how does it work? How does a comic book work? They have some things in common, but different media function differently.

In addition to increased interdisciplinarity and the shift towards cultural studies, another trend touched on by our interviewees is the growing emphasis in their field on "trans" research that crosses borders of diverse kinds (transhistorical, transnational, transgeographic, etc.). This development is also seen as instrumental in diversifying what is considered a "text" by scholars in this field.

Research process

Despite evolving trends in literature and culture scholarship, traditional humanities approaches to research still prevail to a considerable extent. Many of our interviewees report that any new research project begins with the literature review or "diagnosis," as one scholar puts it. To perform this diagnosis, these researchers avail themselves of a range of established bibliographic resources (from online journal indexes to online library catalogs and federated searching tools), professional networks, and web searches in order to gauge the viability of a topic. Once a project is underway, footnote tracking or "chaining" remains a favored discovery method.

Similarly, reliance on close reading remains a hallmark method among this group of researchers, despite expansion in the types of source materials considered "texts":

> I think as a discipline what we do have is close attention to language, so that's why I still think we should know how to analyze things closely in a detailed way and with respect to their discourse.[…] So, in my department, we still have a canon for students at the Master's level […]. There's still a canonical group of texts from all periods, from both continents that students read. And I think they need to develop their skills in analyzing those things and that their analysis, let's say, of film and photographs, paintings, should come from our discipline rather than from, let's say, an art historical perspective. […] I think if we're going to be in this discipline then we have to preserve something about it. That's why I still think that close reading skills are great things to have.

However, the same interviewee also highlighted the importance of combining traditional close reading techniques with more innovative approaches, remarking that literary analysis should no longer exist in a vacuum: “It can’t be done alone.”

Primary sources

Types and formats

These scholars use a very broad and eclectic range of primary source materials in their projects, including both conventional literary and non-literary “texts.” These materials (and formats) include but are not confined to:

- Archival and special collections (e.g. manuscripts, personal papers, correspondence, legal briefs, radio show recordings)
- Print/published materials: books (literature), rare books, journal runs, comics, newspapers and magazines, speeches, reviews, etc.
- Audiovisual materials
- Microform
- Photographs, paintings
- Free online materials: websites, videos, social media, etc.
- Physical objects
- Oral interviews (ethnography)

Disciplinary research can vary widely with respect to the sources consulted to reach an end goal. Theatre and drama scholars, for example, employ an array of sources not limited by traditional formats; indeed, in this subfield, it is common practice to consult professionals, often in person, thereby using experts as sources: “I found a costume designer in [the United States] whose work is just absolutely out there, and brilliant, and startling, and she's just my absolute go to person for costume.”

Many of our interviewees consult archival and special collections in their research, and report relying on these materials heavily. Several highlight the continuing need for domestic and/or international travel in order to access archival and special materials. This is seen as necessary because many archival materials are not available for interlibrary loan or have not yet been digitized; the inadequate description of materials held in archives worldwide is also cited as a reason. Finding aids are viewed as valuable, although it was not clear from interviewees’ responses whether alternative forms of description of archival materials would be preferable. One interviewee who relies particularly heavily on archival and special materials in their own research discussed incorporating archival and primary source research into their graduate and undergraduate teaching (“an archival class”), and remarked on their twofold use of the library in this context: “So I use the libraries in two ways, as a scholar, and I use it as a teacher as well, which is probably a little more unusual.”

Access preferences

Personal book collections remain important to several scholars, particularly for print primary sources that they consult often: “I have quite an extensive personal library”; “for the main [...] sources I have paper books and I own them”; “mainstream sources […] I’ve been literally ordering them through Amazon.” While some of our interviewees do not rely heavily on the library’s print collections for access to primary sources, preferring to build their own personal book collections, others remain frequent users of print primary sources owned by the library (as well as other repositories): “I am happy [...] to have checked out copies that the library has of critical editions I don’t have”; “I need to find repositories that have the primary documents. And I know Google’s done a lot and I’ve been impressed, but they haven’t done everything.”

Several of our interviewees emphasize that, for them, browsing the stacks and serendipity still play critical roles in the research process. In this context, some seized the opportunity to speak about the transfer of onsite print materials to offsite storage, which they perceive as problematical from the perspective of access and discovery:

> It’s one of the largest research libraries in the nation […], and the resources are easily accessible. A little less in the last years because of the relocation of part of the collection to [offsite storage].
>
> I think that the massive transfer of books to [offsite storage] is making life in the library less interesting than it used to be. So I understand all the reasons why books have been moved, but I also see the advantage of having a collection in front of you and walking through it. It’s always been a great source of inspiration and new ideas of serendipitous discovery.

Broadly speaking, our interviewees regard online availability of primary sources favorably, thanks to increased ease of access: “It’s nice to be able to access something on PDF if I’m home and it’s two in the morning.” However, print remains the preferred format for textual primary sources owing to the ways in which these scholars report interacting with such sources: “I mean, it’s usually much more efficient to have a physical book and flip through it.” One scholar discussed the cognitive dimension of reading print books in this context:

> I have read some books online. But I usually like just to have a hold of a book and then I find it more efficient to read it that way […]. I think it develops better reading practices too. I tell my students if they’re going to get a PDF or something, print it, mark it up for analysis […]. I think using your hand is better. It’s also something I’ve learned through cognitive studies.

Secondary sources

Types and formats

As is the case with primary sources, our interviewees consult an array of secondary sources in their research. These include, but are not confined to, traditional sources such as monographs, articles,

reviews, essay collections, conference proceedings, and reference works, as well as less traditional and less scholarly sources of information such as YouTube interviews, tweets, and social media.

The scholarly tools most frequently used by our interviewees to locate secondary sources include the library OPAC and WorldCat, as well as catalogs of other research libraries. The most popular scholarly databases are the MLA International Bibliography, Google Scholar, JSTOR, Project Muse, and subject-specific databases. While the MLA International Bibliography is a go-to resource for many interviewees, some commented on the limitations of this tool, notably gaps in its coverage of international (i.e. non-English language) journal publications.

Access preferences

For monographs, interviewees report purchasing personal copies if they intend to make substantial use of the materials: "The monographs, yes, my library is at home." In several cases, a preference for physical access to monographs (through the library) is expressed: "Yeah, I [...] still use the library physically, so I actually like going up to the [library book stacks] and walking past the shelves, trying to see what I can find."

For access to articles and article-like content (essays, proceedings, etc.), the online medium is heavily favored, even in fields of study that have traditionally been regarded as print-loving: "I don't usually come and take out journal volumes. Print versions anymore"; "It's a collection of essays on the topic, but I only want one. I'll go get it from the library. Or I'll use the digital tools and just PDF that chapter." Online access is also seen as preferable for reference sources owing to ease of use, enhanced search functionality, and currency of content.

Overall, this group of scholars is comfortable relying on electronic access for secondary sources, with the exception (in some cases) of monographs. Convenience is a deciding factor here:

> Well, I do my secondary source research very differently than I used to do, because now it's done – I mean, it's just done via the digitized collections. So you do a search, and you find out what's where, and then you go and find the digitized issue of the particular journal, and you download the thing onto your computer, and you stick it into a folder on your computer, and you read it later.

Some scholars report relying on online databases, e-journals, and e-books to such an extent that they become frustrated when they encounter difficulties retrieving online content: "There are moments like that where I'm like, 'Am I doing something wrong? Or can I – where did JSTOR go today?'"

Limitations of online access

While the majority of our interviewees acknowledge the advantages of online accessibility, particularly of secondary sources, it is important to note that several also take a markedly critical view of electronic databases and the web. Their concerns range from what we might call the architecture or functionality

of online tools to subscription costs and, in particular, the comprehensiveness of the content available online: how well their field is represented in digital format is a central consideration.

When asked about how well they understood the online tools they use to find information, their responses were sharp and insightful. While they may not have deep technical understanding of the algorithms used in any given search engine or database, they are mindful of the constraints of online searching in general:

> One more comment about online research, which is what we are all doing these days, there's always this sense that we are missing out on something. I always feel I never get the complete information and I sometimes have to tell myself, "Stop searching, it's probably fine." But there's always that sense that if one had only the right keyword […] and I sometimes even start wondering if the server or the browser that I use, based on the fact that I'm based in the US, gives me very different results from the results that I would get if I were based in [another country].

The same interviewee reflected on inequalities between information-rich institutions or countries and their less privileged counterparts:

> I'm very much aware that I'm privileged in a sense that I do have access to databases that are expensive and not every university pays for it. In [a different region of the world], you cannot assume that everybody has access to JSTOR, for example. So, I'm privileged in that sense. But I also feel that with the open searches, I'm probably getting different results from the results that people in [a different region of the world] get and that worries me.

Another dwelt in this context on the more practical problem of digital preservation, emphasizing that while the digital format may offer ease of access, it cannot be relied on by libraries as a stable medium for long-term collection building, particularly not for primary source collections. Exclusive reliance on online access by libraries, in particular for primary source materials, is therefore seen by this scholar as problematical.

Scholarly communication

Outputs

At R1 institutions, the gold standard for promotion and tenure in literary and cultural studies remains the single-authored book-length monograph and a complement of peer-reviewed articles. When publishing in peer-reviewed venues, scholars in certain subfields are not necessarily bound to publish in English-language journals: depending on the subfield, publication in a reputable foreign-language academic journal is regarded as acceptable and appropriate. Conference presentations also count as traditional outputs. Alternative outputs were mentioned by a few interviewees. Among Theatre scholars, filmed productions are commonplace. One interviewee noted a growing trend among their peers of publishing in non-peer-reviewed, "public facing" outlets like the *Los Angeles Review of Books*, but expressed the view that such labors detract from more serious scholarship.

Overall, it emerged clearly from several responses that, due to the rigors of the tenure process at R1 institutions, scholars are not inclined to explore less traditional forms of scholarship, such as museum exhibitions and digital humanities projects, during the early stages of their professional careers: "I postponed the [digital] project because I – yes, I wanted both of my books published, and it's true that it's still what mattered the most for my tenure." By the same token, several of our scholars reported feeling much more at ease pursuing non-traditional scholarly activities after earning tenure. One interviewee developed a highly successful traveling exhibit of photographs as a companion project to her second book. Now a full professor, the same scholar is currently seeking a non-academic press for her newest book manuscript – which, incidentally, was written in a foreign language. Free from the strictures of promotion and tenure, she is looking for a local non-academic publisher for this work because "giving back to the very people and subjects that contributed to it […] that's kind of my new […] method to my madness these days […], decolonizing my own work instead of [going with a reputable academic press]."

Digital scholarship

Few interviewees reported personal involvement in digital projects of any kind. Attitudes towards digital scholarship in general were, however, favorable. One interviewee underscored the value of "open-source" scholarly outputs such as crowd-sourced websites, and digitized archives of marginal and ephemeral sources. Another acknowledged the power of publishing in digital format, and the capacity of the digital medium to incorporate elements that a physical book cannot capture:

> And this is, I think, relevant for libraries. To do a really robust transmedial project, is hard. Because not only do you have to know about other disciplines, which is – whatever; I'm going to do my best. But it really by all rights, should be a book that is a purely digital book, so that image, sound file, moving image can all be seamlessly integrated in. So the illustrations can be right there. I've looked into this in a number of different ways, through whatever the one out of [that university] is called, the […] I've just got [a certain platform] in my head, because that's the [inaudible].

When asked about digital scholarship in relation to trends in their departments, our interviewees held mixed opinions. One remarked on the increasing uptake of digital humanities among current graduate students. Another described increasing acceptance of digital scholarship at a departmental level: "I think in this department efforts are made to recognize digital research as a legitimate type of research." Others, however, expressed diametrically opposing views: "our standards haven't changed"; "I don't think we're there yet." Perhaps predictably, concerns about the evaluation of digital scholarship in the context of promotion and tenure were voiced in this context. One interviewee doubted that digital scholarship could count as a viable form of scholarship at R1 institutions for as long as it does not undergo traditional peer review, which is characterized as "maintaining the standard."

Academic social networking

Rather like attitudes towards digital scholarship, uptake of academic social networking (Facebook, LinkedIn, Academia.edu, etc.) is mixed among this set of interviewees. For some, networking is still more

likely to take place along conventional lines: through professional meetings, research working groups, and email listservs. At the other end of the spectrum, some interviewees discussed the need for younger scholars to engage in social media/networking, not as an end in itself, but rather as a way to involve them in a larger academic conversation as well as to promote their own scholarship:

> I don't. I really, I'm just like, I – in a certain sense, I run my race, right? I mean, I don't feel like I want to work at [another university], and I don't feel like I need a presence. But I do think for the younger generation, it's increasingly important for them to have a presence and a wide array of platforms […] I mean whether it be Twitter or online journals.

Similarly, another scholar discussed the place of blogs and other online social networks in the academy, highlighting the problem that while these venues have increasing importance in scholarly discourse ('there are scholars out there who use their blogs as a place to really do work"), little value is attached to such work at the institutional level ("I don't think that kind of work gets understood to be scholarship in the institution").

There is consensus among this group that Academia.edu poses certain ethical problems. Copyright issues are identified as a major barrier to use: "it's unclear […] whether you're violating copyright to some degree"; "I haven't put things up there because they're all under copyright and I find that a meaningful category still." Even more problematical is the fact that Academia.edu puts scholarship behind pay walls: "But also not everyone can have access to sources. So I don't know if then that leads to sharing things. You know what I'm saying? So it becomes kind of this black market." For these reasons, some of our interviewees report actively discouraging their graduate students from using this platform.

Interestingly, one interviewee contrasted venues such as Academia.edu with the institutional repository IUScholarWorks:

> I believe in the merits of the open-access policy that was adopted […] precisely because it maintains the peer review requirement and because it has been designed according to the academic standard. I am strongly against the private, for profit networks, social academic networks, such as Academia.edu, because those made profits out of the scholarship that we create and make available through these.

Despite these advantages, very few of these scholars report depositing their work in the institutional repository. The desire to share one's work widely and effectively, as well as in an ethical way, was expressed by several, but many seemed at a loss as to how to go about this: "I don't know how to share my work."

Research training and support

Interviewees' own training

Some of the scholars interviewed describe research as an isolating pursuit: "we work in what we call silos." Moreover, the research process is viewed as idiosyncratic, involving sifting through a significant

amount of information, often as a means of inspiration or simply as a way to discard irrelevant sources: "it's a funny way of going, sitting about getting information by discarding […] a lot of stuff." This notwithstanding, most of our interviewees received what they describe as some form of research training. Some had training in bibliographic software: "I was doing research and I did not know how to store the files. You know they have EndNote. And then I went and did a workshop. [...] And now I send the grad students." Other types of training recalled by our interviewees include digital humanities workshops (typically offered by a campus arts and humanities center rather than by a library), as well as classes on special collections: "One of my graduate courses […] was taught by the then director of the early modern collection in the [Rare Books] Library. […] That course taught me contents, but also taught me how to use the library." A few scholars reported taking specific research methods courses as graduate students: "we had to do a course in research methods I think it was called […]. So, that training was helpful and useful."

A few reported receiving little or no formal research training at all: "So yeah, I had no training, as far as research was concerned, really. Just very little. And this was around the time, too, when Google was digitizing, like that mass digitization." These interviewees describe their own research training as informal – as arising out of mentoring or self-discovery ("I just figured it out myself, pretty much"). For one, recalling their own lack of training in graduate school led to reflections on current shortcomings of departments in this regard:

> In graduate school, I never had anyone tell me, 'This is how you conduct research.' I started writing papers on my own and I go looking for stuff. And I feel the same problem with my own graduate students. I don't feel I have a course or a dedicated time to train students in research. Everybody just probably cross their fingers and pray that people will know what research means. And they just send the students to do research. So I spend a lot of my teaching service time sitting down with students and sharing what I do and not taking it for granted.

Graduate students

The majority of our interviewees expressed less interest in receiving research training themselves than in possibilities for their students. A lack of depth in student research ability was noted by several:

> But you know, it bothers me that students just use Wikipedia and the internet.

> We don't talk about that here. Yeah, I think it's a tragedy. Honestly, I think that both on a – as far as the [disciplinary] department is concerned, undergraduate and graduates, definitely need […] to strengthen their relationship with the libraries and start working with the library.

In general, there was consensus among this group of scholars regarding the value of making graduate students in particular aware of the library's resources and services. There was also agreement that librarians can play a key role in influencing research projects, both from a methodological point of view as well as by sharing their expertise in (special) collections. Several of our interviewees made specific recommendations for the types of training that libraries should offer graduate students:

- Training in bibliographic software
- Digital humanities training

- GIS training
- Classes taught through and with primary sources and special collections
- Interdisciplinary training ("programs that enable students to go outside the department")
- Alternative-Academic (Alt-Ac) training

Alt-Ac training was understood as incorporating training in information technology that can benefit students regardless of whether or not they become academics, and training in research skills that can be translated into any professional context. One interviewee emphasized that Alt-Ac training can avoid the pitfall not avoided by academic departments of training students "for things they won't have a chance of doing." Library training was perceived as valuable to graduate students not only as future academics, but also as future thinkers and professionals generally:

> I think that oftentimes students come in wanting to learn more about their subject whereas the library training facilitates their full development as thinkers and intellectuals. And people who can pursue research ideas no matter what that question is.

Two perceived obstacles were highlighted in relation to library graduate programming. The first of these was the problem of students' priorities:

> I'm not saying that there are no resources, because the library has tons of resources and I keep sharing with the students, but I think people don't know their priorities. They think, 'Okay. I need to write my paper. I don't have time to go learn about writing papers.' You know? When they actually have to invest three hours to learn how to do it before they go do it.

Secondly, it was suggested that the library should promote graduate student training opportunities in a systematic fashion: "If there is something that the library would offer systematically, if there is a list of things that you can point me in that direction so I could look at that list and say, 'Okay, I want this and this.'"

Faculty

As noted above, interviewees were on the whole less interested in library training opportunities for themselves than for their (graduate) students. Some depicted themselves as no longer needing training ("I'm an old dog, you know. I've been doing this for a while."). For others, this was less a matter of need than of interest and time: "I realized that I lack a lot of training […] in the field [digital humanities]. […] I would probably prefer to delegate this work to an undergraduate student"; "I know it would be helpful to me to come over here and, you know, find out about new things. But I'm never certain whether it's going to address anything that I would actually use." Current library services that facilitate access to materials were mentioned as particularly useful: "Well, me too, I mean, I get my books delivered to me now – Because I can pick them up downstairs – I get them online."

A couple of our interviewees did express a desire to learn more about the "tools" of conducting research, specifically how electronic searches and databases function: "As things become more virtual and digital, it's become much more important for me to understand the tools. Do I want to understand the tools? Not really but I want – for the purposes of efficacy, yes, I need to." It was remarked that librarians should have expertise in this area:

> I think that librarians should be able to help, and make visible to or make available to scholars, this kind of information. You know, how the algorithms work, what the system is, how they – things rise to the top. And people who are really doing this work seriously, you know, scholars who are working with that kind of search engines, they do learn, and they know how to go to the library and say, 'Hey, somebody come help me,' and somebody will help them. But I think generally, it's increasingly something that scholars should understand more than they do.

Further forms of training and support for faculty that were touched on as potentially useful by our interviewees included support for faculty who are editing journals, and help for faculty needing to obtain the rights to use certain items (notably images) in their publications.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As was noted in the Introduction to this report, our interviewees represented a mix of junior to senior humanities faculty pursuing research in diverse languages, literatures, and cultures. Some of our interviewees engage principally in literary analysis, whereas others pursue somewhat broader and more eclectic "cultural studies" research. As might be expected given this heterogeneity of research areas and interests, interviewees' responses did not always result in a uniform picture.

It is nevertheless possible to extract a number of conclusions from our findings, which in turn suggest several potential areas of focus as well as specific actions that might be taken at the IU Bloomington Libraries. These conclusions and recommendations can be grouped under two main headings: Collections and Services.

Collections

- Our interviewees describe a shift from a more narrowly conceived literary studies to a broader cultural studies, and an attendant expansion of what is considered a "text" in their field.
  - → In the light of this, continue to build broad and deep collections of both textual and non-textual sources to support scholarship in literature and culture.

- Some of our interviewees also describe a trend towards increasing "decolonization" of literary and cultural studies.
  - → Against this backdrop, continue to build rich international or global collections in the humanities.
  - → Furthermore, continue to explore and develop methods and opportunities for making web and open-access content from around the world discoverable by local users.

- In general, this group of scholars is reluctant to rely exclusively on online access for primary sources.
  - → Acknowledging this reluctance, continue to maintain and build robust physical collections of both textual and non-textual primary sources in the humanities.

→ Considering also that many of our interviewees report relying heavily on special and archival materials in their work, maintain a focus on developing distinctive and/or special collections to support and stimulate research in this field.

- This group of scholars is on the whole comfortable relying on online access for secondary sources, with the exception of monographs.
  → Where possible, privilege electronic access for journals, article-like content (e.g. volumes of essays and conference proceedings), and reference materials to support the preferences of scholars in this field.
  → However, given that reliance on electronic access for monographs remains a more contentious issue, avoid pursuing this as a strategy without consulting humanities faculty on campus.

Services

- Several interviewees expressed the desire to share their scholarship more widely, and in ethical ways, but did not know how to go about this.
  → There thus seems to be a need for intensified or more targeted education of humanities faculty on alternative forms of scholarly communication, in particular education on the campus open-access mandate and IUScholarWorks.
  → Librarians should seek out opportunities to explain and promote alternative methods of scholarly communication to humanities faculty.

- Digital scholarship continues to gain ground with researchers in literature and culture despite limitations imposed by institutional promotion and tenure requirements. Scholars working in this field are increasingly interested in engaging in digital arts and humanities, but often lack the requisite skills.
  → In the light of this, develop concrete and hands-on training opportunities in digital arts and humanities for subject librarians in order to better situate them to serve as advisors to researchers contemplating digital scholarship.

- There is consensus among this group of scholars on the value of library training for graduate students.
  → Considering this, take steps to ensure that academic departments are apprised of current graduate programming.
  → Additionally, bearing in mind the time constraints identified as an obstacle to successful library programming for graduate students, better coordinate graduate library training opportunities between library departments and units as well as with external partners.

- Based on interviewees' responses, there also seem to be opportunities for librarians to work more closely with academic departments on the design of graduate library training in the humanities.
  → Where not already offered, consider implementing the types of training identified by our interviewees as particularly helpful to graduate students in their field.
  → Where possible, pursue a collaborative (library-departmental) approach to graduate library programming. Directors of Graduate Studies within academic departments are obvious partners in such a strategy.

- There is also some evidence of interest in library training for faculty among this group of scholars.
    → Librarians may therefore wish to consider offering some of the more specialized types of training mentioned under this heading above.

APPENDIX 1

Semi-structured interview questions

1. **Research focus and methods**

   Describe the research project(s) you are currently working on.

   - Could you describe how your research for this/these project(s) has unfolded?
   - How does this project and these methods relate to work you have done previously?
   - How does your current research relate to the work typically done in your department(s) and in the scholarly field(s) with which you are affiliated?

2. **Working with archives and special collections**

   Do you rely on material collected in archives or other special collections in your research? If so:

   - How do you typically find this information? How did you learn how to do this? Does anyone ever help you?
   - Where and how do you access this information?
   - Do you use any specific approaches or tools when working with this kind of information?
   - Have you encountered any challenges in the process of finding, accessing, or working with this kind of information? If so, describe.
   - To what extent do you understand (and/or think it is important to understand) how the tools that help you find and access this information function (e.g. finding aids, catalogs)? Do you care to understand?
   - Are there any resources, services, or other supports that would help you locate or work with this kind of information more effectively?

3. **Working with secondary sources**

   What types of secondary sources do you typically rely on in your research?

   - How do you find this information? How did you learn to do this? Does anyone ever help you?
   - Where and how do you access this information?
   - Do you use any specific approaches or tools when working with this kind of information?
   - Have you encountered any challenges in the process of finding, accessing, or working with secondary sources? If so, describe.
   - To what extent do you understand (and/or think it is important to understand) how the tools that help you find and access this information function (e.g. algorithms, relevancy ranking)? Do you care to understand?
   - Are there any resources, services, or other supports that would help you locate or work with secondary sources more effectively?

4. Scholarly communications and evaluating impact

How are your scholarly outputs evaluated by your institution, and to what ends?

- Have you observed any trends and/or changes over time in how your scholarly outputs are being evaluated?
- Beyond tenure and promotion, does your institution evaluate your scholarly outputs towards other ends (e.g. benchmarking of performance)? If so, how, and to what ends? Have you observed these other evaluations having a broader effect on your department and/or institutional culture?

Do you engage with, or have interest in, any mechanisms for sharing your work beyond traditional publishing in scholarly monographs or peer-reviewed journals? If so, to what ends?

Do you engage with any forms of social networking, including academic social networking, as a mechanism for sharing and/or engaging with other scholars? If not, why not? If so:

- Describe the platform(s) you currently use and how.
- What do you like best about the platform(s) you currently use and what do you like least?
- Are there ways in which the platform(s) could be improved to best meet your needs?

Beyond the information you have already shared about your scholarly communications activities and needs, is there anything else you think it would be helpful for me to know about your experiences in this area?

5. Research training and conclusion

Looking back at your experiences as a researcher, are there any forms of training that you found particularly useful? Are there any forms of training you would still like to get? Why?

Considering evolving trends in how research is conducted and evaluated, is there any form of training that you think would be most beneficial to graduate students and/or scholars more widely?

Based on your experiences and perspectives as a researcher generally at this institution, is there anything else that you would like to share with me?